# The Craft of Rule

Elite Administrative Knowledge as Apprenticed Mastery in Moses and Sertorius

Thomas J. Bryan

*February 2026*

## Abstract

This paper examines elite administrative knowledge as a form of craft expertise comparable to traditional artisanal skills, transmitted through prolonged apprenticeship rather than written instruction alone. Through a sustained comparison of two historical figures—Moses, trained in the Egyptian royal court, and Quintus Sertorius, educated through the Roman cursus honorum—the analysis demonstrates that the capacity to organize populations at scale constitutes a specialized skill set acquired through years of practical immersion within elite institutional contexts. When political upheaval displaces such trained individuals from their original power structures, they retain this embodied expertise and can rebuild authority in new settings by adapting their organizational knowledge to local conditions. Both Moses and Sertorius followed strikingly parallel trajectories: each received decades of elite training in a sophisticated imperial system; each was expelled through violence or political conflict; each encountered populations with strong local identities but lacking systematic organizational infrastructure; each provided the administrative capacity that transformed those populations into coordinated polities; and each legitimated his authority through claims of supernatural guidance adapted to local belief systems. The critical variable separating their legacies was duration—Moses survived forty years, long enough for his institutions to solidify and his successor to be prepared, while Sertorius was assassinated after roughly eight years, before his systems could achieve comparable depth. By reconceptualizing elite power as craft mastery rather than divine inspiration or mere institutional position, this analysis reveals why the techniques of large-scale social coordination, like the techniques of metallurgy or architecture, accumulate over generations, require extensive apprenticeship to master, remain portable when practitioners are displaced, and can be adapted to varied cultural contexts while retaining their essential logic.



**Keywords:** elite reproduction, craft knowledge, administrative expertise, apprenticeship, displaced elites, state formation, tacit knowledge, legitimation, Moses, Sertorius

# Introduction: The Puzzle of Portable Power

In 72 BCE, Marcus Perperna assassinated Quintus Sertorius at a banquet in Hispania, bringing to an abrupt end one of Rome's most extraordinary provincial experiments. For nearly a decade, Sertorius—a Roman general proscribed during Sulla's civil war purges—had governed a breakaway state on the Iberian Peninsula using Roman administrative principles. He had trained Iberian warriors in Roman military tactics, established a senate of three hundred drawn from Roman exiles and native chiefs, founded schools teaching Latin and Greek to the children of Iberian aristocrats, and fielded armies that repeatedly defeated Rome's finest commanders. Within weeks of his assassination, his entire political structure collapsed. Perperna, attempting to assume leadership, was swiftly defeated by Pompey, and the Iberian tribes sued for peace. Without Sertorius, the sophisticated governmental apparatus he had built simply ceased to function.

Over a millennium earlier and a thousand miles to the southeast, Moses—raised in Pharaoh's court and, according to Acts 7:22, educated "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians"—led the Israelites out of Egypt and, during forty years of wilderness wandering, established a comprehensive legal code, a hierarchical administrative structure, a professional priestly class, and a religious-political system whose foundations would endure for millennia. When Moses died within sight of Canaan, his carefully prepared successor Joshua assumed command, and the institutional framework Moses had built continued to function, eventually evolving into the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

These two figures, separated by more than a thousand years and operating in radically different cultural contexts, followed remarkably similar trajectories. Both received elite training in sophisticated imperial administrative systems. Both were forced into exile through violence or political conflict. Both encountered populations with strong local identities but lacking the organizational infrastructure for sustained coordinated action. Both provided the administrative capacity that transformed those populations. Both legitimated their authority through claims of supernatural guidance—Moses through the burning bush and the miracles of the Exodus, Sertorius through a white fawn he claimed carried messages from the goddess Diana. Both adapted their elite training to local conditions rather than mechanically imposing foreign systems. The critical difference was duration: Moses survived long enough to build robust institutions and establish clear succession, while Sertorius was killed before his systems could fully solidify.

This pattern—trained elite displaced from original power structure, relocates to new context, rebuilds authority by providing organizational capacity, succeeds or fails based on survival and institutional depth—is not a coincidence. The conventional explanations for such figures are unsatisfying. Attributing success to divine inspiration or prophetic

insight simply relocates the question without answering it: why do "divinely chosen" leaders so consistently possess prior elite training? Crediting exceptional individual genius fails to explain why such brilliance emerges almost exclusively from classes with access to specialized education. Invoking historical accident cannot account for the systematic nature of the pattern.

This paper proposes a different framework. Elite administrative knowledge functions as craft expertise, comparable to the mastery possessed by a blacksmith, a master stonemason, or an experienced ship captain. Like these traditional crafts, the ability to organize populations at scale requires years of apprenticeship under experienced practitioners. It involves substantial tacit knowledge that cannot be fully codified in written instructions. It accumulates and refines over generations through master-apprentice transmission. It remains portable when practitioners are displaced from their original contexts. And it can be adapted to new circumstances while retaining its essential logic. A blacksmith trained in Damascus can practice his craft in Paris because the fundamental understanding of how to work metal resides in his hands and mind rather than in any particular forge. Similarly, an administrator trained in Roman provincial governance can apply that expertise in Hispania, or an official educated in Egyptian bureaucratic systems can organize a tribal confederation, because the core competencies of large-scale social coordination are portable and adaptable.

The implications of this reconceptualization are significant. It explains why elite power reproduces so consistently across generations through aristocratic dynasties and father-son lineages—not through genetic superiority but through systematic apprenticeship from childhood. It clarifies why displaced elites can rebuild power in entirely new environments—their expertise travels with them even when they lose position, wealth, or institutional backing. It reveals why access to elite training remains so carefully restricted through expensive education, credentialing requirements, and social network prerequisites—the scarcity maintains the value of the craft. And it illuminates a dimension of the biblical text that theological readings tend to obscure: that the organizational genius attributed to Moses reflects not unique prophetic inspiration but the application of Egyptian administrative craft knowledge, adapted with great skill to a radically different social context.

The purpose of this paper is not to diminish Moses or to reduce the biblical narrative to mere politics. It is to use a secular parallel—Sertorius, whose career is documented by Plutarch, Appian, and other near-contemporary historians without theological overlay—to illuminate how power actually works in the Old Testament. When we see the same pattern operating in a well-documented Roman context, the mechanisms at work in the Exodus narrative become clearer. What Moses did was extraordinary. But it was extraordinary in the way that a master craftsman's work is extraordinary: the product of

decades of training, deep expertise, and brilliant adaptation, not a bolt from the heavens.

## Administration as Craft Knowledge

To understand what Moses and Sertorius actually did—and why their achievements were so difficult to replicate by those who lacked their training—requires first understanding what distinguishes craft knowledge from other kinds of knowing. The distinction matters because we tend to think of "administration" as something intellectual, something that can be picked up from a manual or a set of instructions. We think of it as fundamentally different from what a blacksmith or a ship captain knows. This is wrong, and the error obscures the real nature of elite power.

Craft knowledge is, first of all, substantially tacit rather than explicit. The philosopher Michael Polanyi captured this dimension with his observation that "we know more than we can tell." A master blacksmith knows when metal has reached the correct temperature for forging by its color—a deep cherry red for certain operations, an orange glow for others, a yellow-white heat for welding. This knowledge cannot be fully reduced to temperature measurements because the smith is making a holistic judgment that integrates color, the behavior of the fire, the ambient conditions, the specific piece being worked, and countless subtle factors accumulated through years of practice. He can point to the glowing metal and say "that's right," and with effort he might articulate some of the reasoning, but the skilled perception itself—the immediate recognition that this is the correct moment to strike—cannot be fully captured in written instructions. A novice reading "heat to cherry red" will make errors that seem inexplicable until years of experience develop the perceptual discrimination that the master takes for granted.

An experienced administrator possesses exactly this kind of tacit expertise. He knows when a meeting requires formal procedures and when informal conversation will be more productive. He recognizes when subordinates are providing accurate information and when they are concealing problems. He intuits when to intervene directly in a developing crisis and when to allow local resolution. He reads the mood of a crowd, senses when a negotiation is approaching its breaking point, and understands instinctively how far he can push a subordinate before resentment undermines compliance. These judgments draw on pattern recognition developed through years of experience—the administrator perceives similarities between the current situation and hundreds of previous cases, intuits likely trajectories, and responds appropriately without necessarily being able to articulate his reasoning in a way that would allow someone else to replicate it.

Second, craft knowledge requires extended apprenticeship under experienced practitioners. Reading about blacksmithing, even studying detailed manuals with

photographs and precise measurements, does not make one a blacksmith. One must work at the forge under supervision, initially performing simple tasks, gradually taking on more complex work, making countless errors and receiving correction, developing the muscle memory and perceptual acuity through repetition over years. The Dreyfus model of skill acquisition identifies five stages—novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient, expert—and progression through these stages requires sustained practice with feedback. A novice follows explicit rules rigidly. An expert has internalized principles to the point that appropriate responses flow naturally without conscious deliberation. This transformation requires thousands of hours of deliberate practice and cannot be substantially accelerated through reading or observation alone.

The same is true of administration. The sons of Roman senators accompanied their fathers to the Forum from childhood, observed legal proceedings and political negotiations, served in subordinate positions in provincial governance, and gradually assumed increasing responsibility over decades. This was not primarily classroom education but learning through observation and supervised practice. The young aristocrat absorbed how to conduct negotiations, when to make concessions and when to stand firm, how to manage subordinates, how to balance competing factions, how to maintain authority while appearing accessible—skills that cannot be learned from books because they require calibrated responses to dynamic situations, reading social cues, adjusting tactics based on feedback, and developing the confidence and presence that comes only from repeated practice. An Egyptian prince educated in the royal court learned administration through the same kind of immersion. He observed how Pharaoh's officials managed vast construction projects, how they coordinated grain storage and distribution, how they adjudicated disputes, how they organized military campaigns. By the time he was a mature man, he had been steeped in administrative practice for decades.

Third, craft knowledge accumulates and refines over generations. A contemporary blacksmith inherits techniques developed over millennia—case-hardening, pattern-welding, differential tempering. Each generation of practitioners makes small refinements, discovers better methods, adapts to new materials, and passes these improvements to apprentices. The individual craftsman need not understand the underlying physics; many traditional techniques were perfected centuries before the science that explains them was developed. But the craftsman benefits from this generational accumulation of practical wisdom about what works. The craft tradition is longer-lived and potentially more sophisticated than any individual practitioner. The same is true of administrative systems. The legal codes that Moses promulgated bore striking similarities to the Code of Hammurabi and other Ancient Near Eastern legal traditions, which themselves reflected centuries of development. No single individual invented these legal principles. They emerged through generations of rulers and administrators discovering what maintains social order, what disputes arise repeatedly,

what punishments deter effectively, what regulations facilitate commerce. Similarly, Roman administrative practice in the late Republic reflected centuries of experience governing provinces, managing diverse populations, and integrating conquered territories. When Sertorius deployed this knowledge in Hispania, he was drawing on an accumulated wisdom vastly more sophisticated than anything he could have developed independently.

Fourth, craft knowledge is portable and adaptable. The master blacksmith can practice his trade in different cities, different countries, even different continents, because the fundamental expertise resides in him rather than in any particular workshop or set of tools. He will need to adapt to different ores, different fuels, different customer preferences, but the core understanding of how to work metal transfers across these contexts. When Sertorius fled to Hispania, he did not bring Roman institutions with him in any physical sense. He retained knowledge of how those institutions functioned—how a senate deliberates and makes decisions, how legal codes standardize dispute resolution, how military units organize and coordinate, how taxation systems mobilize resources, how schools create cultural cohesion across generations. He adapted these principles to Iberian context, exercising craft judgment about what to preserve, what to modify, and what to abandon. When Moses led the Israelites into the wilderness, he faced the same challenge of adaptation: Egyptian organizational principles had to be fitted to a pastoral, tribal population with a completely different social structure. The skill lay not in mechanical imposition but in creative adaptation—knowing which elements of the inherited system were essential and which were culturally specific packaging.

Finally, and most importantly for understanding why elite power is so durable, craft knowledge cannot be acquired simply by understanding that it exists. Knowing about blacksmithing is not the same as knowing how to forge a sword. Knowing about administrative technique is not the same as possessing the embodied expertise to deploy it. Many revolutionary theorists have analyzed how elites maintain domination—Marx dissected ideological control, Gramsci examined cultural hegemony, Foucault traced disciplinary power—but this theoretical understanding has not prevented revolutionary movements from reproducing elite hierarchies when they come to power. The reason is structural: understanding about craft differs fundamentally from possessing craft mastery. The embodied expertise, the tacit knowledge, the pattern recognition developed through years of practice—these cannot be acquired through reading alone, any more than reading about surgery makes one a surgeon.

## Moses: Egyptian Statecraft Applied to Tribal Confederation

## The Apprenticeship

According to Exodus 2:10, Moses was adopted by Pharaoh's daughter and raised in the royal household. The statement in Acts 7:22 that Moses was "educated in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and was powerful in speech and action" has sometimes been treated as pious embellishment, but the archaeological and textual evidence about elite Egyptian education suggests it should be taken quite seriously. The "wisdom of the Egyptians" was not abstract philosophy. It was practical statecraft—the accumulated expertise of one of history's most administratively sophisticated civilizations.

Egyptian elite education during the New Kingdom period—the most commonly proposed setting for Moses, roughly the thirteenth century BCE—was comprehensive, practical, and oriented toward producing competent administrators. Archaeological evidence from training texts, biographical inscriptions of officials, and studies of the bureaucratic system reveal what such education entailed. Young men being prepared for administrative careers learned literacy in both hieroglyphic and hieratic scripts, itself a marker of extraordinary status given that literacy rates in Egypt were approximately one percent of the population. But this was not mere reading and writing in the modern sense. It involved mastering the complex documentary practices through which Egyptian administration functioned—the formulas for official correspondence, the methods of record-keeping, the protocols for royal communication.

The curriculum extended far beyond literacy. Scribal training texts from the New Kingdom show that apprentice administrators studied legal traditions and case precedents, learning how disputes were typically resolved and what constituted proper evidence and procedure. They studied resource management and accounting—the practical mathematics for calculating agricultural yields, areas, volumes, and tax shares that were essential for managing Egypt's grain-based economy. They received military training, both practical and organizational, learning not only the use of weapons and chariots but how armies are provisioned, how campaigns are planned, how forces are coordinated across distances. They studied diplomatic protocol and negotiation, learning how the royal court conducted relations with foreign powers. And they received extensive instruction in religious administration, which in Egypt was inseparable from governance itself, since temples functioned as economic and administrative centers and Pharaoh's semi-divine status was the foundation of political authority.

The institutional setting for this education is well attested. The kap, an institution attached to the royal palace, served as a school where elite children—including the sons of foreign rulers—studied alongside princes. Thutmose III used this system to "Egyptianize" the children of conquered foreign leaders, training them in Egyptian administrative methods and then returning them to rule their homelands as culturally aligned vassals. The New Kingdom sources indicate multiple schools operating in

Thebes, including facilities at the Mut Temple and at the Ramesseum. Discipline was severe; the Egyptian proverb that "a boy's ear is on his back—he hears when he is beaten" reflects a training culture oriented toward producing men capable of functioning under the pressures of real governance, not gentle intellectuals.

Crucially, this was not merely classroom instruction. It was sustained apprenticeship through observation and supervised practice. Egyptian sources describe students working "under the hand of the scribe," serving as assistants while learning their craft. Positions were substantially hereditary—when the son of a scribe completed his training, he often inherited his father's role—and the relationship between master and apprentice was described in terms that paralleled or overlapped with the father-son bond. An official took on his successor as an assistant so that the younger man would receive on-the-job training and the succession would become almost automatic. A young man raised in the royal court, as Moses was, would have observed the administration in operation daily for decades: how officials managed projects, coordinated labor, adjudicated conflicts, organized supplies, conducted diplomacy, and maintained order across a vast territory. By the traditional biblical chronology placing Moses at roughly forty years of age when he killed the Egyptian overseer and fled, he had spent four decades immersed in Egyptian administrative practice. This was a thorough apprenticeship in statecraft—longer and more comprehensive than most craft apprenticeships in any trade.

## The Displacement

The killing of the Egyptian overseer forced Moses into exile. The biblical account in Exodus 2:11–15 describes Moses observing an Egyptian beating a Hebrew slave, checking that no one was watching, killing the Egyptian, and burying the body. The next day, when Moses attempted to intervene in a dispute between two Hebrews, one challenged him: "Who made you a ruler and judge over us? Do you intend to kill me as you killed the Egyptian?" When Pharaoh learned of the killing, Moses fled to Midian.

Several elements of this narrative merit analysis from a craft-knowledge perspective. First, Moses's intervention against the overseer and his attempted mediation between the two Hebrews suggest someone accustomed to exercising authority but lacking established legitimacy among the Hebrew population. His Egyptian upbringing gave him administrative training but not recognition as a Hebrew leader—a gap he would later need to bridge through other means. Second, his flight to Midian positioned him strategically. Midian, a region southeast of Canaan inhabited by semi-nomadic peoples related to the Israelites, was close enough to maintain awareness of Egyptian and Canaanite affairs but far enough to escape Egyptian pursuit. Third, his forty-year sojourn there, during which he married Jethro's daughter Zipporah and worked as a shepherd, allowed him to learn local conditions with an intimacy that no short visit

could provide. He came to understand the desert terrain, the tribal social structures, the pastoral economy, and the existing religious traditions of the broader Israelite population.

This Midianite period functioned as reconnaissance and preparation rather than idle exile. Like a craftsman studying the materials and constraints of a new project before beginning work, Moses was assessing what the Israelite population possessed—strong clan identities, Yahweh worship traditions, capable fighters, survival skills honed in harsh environments—and what they lacked: unified leadership, systematic law, organizational infrastructure for sustained coordinated action, the capacity to function as a coherent polity rather than a collection of kinship groups. The forty years gave Moses something no amount of theoretical planning could provide: embodied knowledge of the people and the landscape he would eventually need to organize.

## The Organizational Transformation

When Moses returned to Egypt and led the Exodus, he faced a fundamental challenge. The Israelites had tribal identity and religious traditions, but they lacked the organizational infrastructure for independent existence as a unified people. They were not simply escaping slavery; they needed to become a functioning society capable of coordinating action across twelve tribes, maintaining internal order, defending themselves militarily, managing resources during wilderness migration, and eventually establishing themselves in Canaan. Moses provided this capacity by adapting Egyptian administrative principles to Israelite tribal context. The resulting system, described across Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, demonstrates sophisticated organizational design clearly informed by Egyptian expertise.

The hierarchical delegation system described in Exodus 18 is perhaps the clearest example. When Moses's father-in-law Jethro observed him adjudicating disputes from morning to evening, he advised establishing a hierarchy: officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, with routine matters handled at lower levels and only complex or important cases reaching Moses himself. This is a textbook principle of hierarchical delegation, and it precisely mirrors Egyptian administrative practice, where district governors managed local affairs while major decisions went to the pharaoh or his chief officials. The specific numbers represent working heuristics for effective spans of control developed through generations of Egyptian experience managing large populations. Scholars have noted that the Hebrew term for these officials, "sar," has cognates in Egyptian administrative vocabulary, and that the judicial functions described in Exodus 18 parallel those documented in Egyptian administrative texts.

It is worth noting, as biblical scholars have observed, that this organizational innovation occurs in the narrative before the revelation of the law at Sinai. The judicial system precedes the legal code. This detail has troubled some commentators, and the book of

Deuteronomy actually revises the sequence, placing the judicial reform after the Sinai revelation and crediting Moses rather than Jethro with the idea—perhaps precisely because the original account's attribution to a Midianite outsider, and its placement before the divine revelation, seemed to undercut the dignity of Israelite law. But from a craft-knowledge perspective, the original sequence makes perfect sense. An experienced administrator knows that you need a functioning system for resolving disputes before you codify the rules, not after. The institutional infrastructure must be in place before the law can be effectively administered. Moses was building the machinery of governance in the order that a trained administrator would.

The legal material in Exodus 21–23, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy represents a second major application of inherited expertise. Scholars have long noted parallels between Mosaic law and the Code of Hammurabi, including strikingly similar provisions concerning scenarios like a man-goring ox. The case-law structure—"if X occurs, then Y consequence"—follows established Ancient Near Eastern precedents. The collection of roughly one hundred and fifty civil laws in the Pentateuch is, as one scholar has noted, well within the capacity of a suitably trained individual to compile, and indeed is more modest in scope than the 282 laws of Hammurabi's code or the approximately 200 laws of the Hittite corpus. Moses did not invent legal principles from nothing. He codified existing customs and adapted proven legal frameworks using methods he had learned through Egyptian training. The achievement was not originality but adaptation—fitting sophisticated organizational technology to a new social context.

The establishment of the Levites as a hereditary priestly class supported by systematic tithing created a permanent administrative cadre. This mirrors Egyptian temple administration, where priestly officials managed religious functions, economic resources, and record-keeping simultaneously. The Levites served as scribes, judges, teachers, and religious officials—a professional organizational infrastructure that could maintain continuity and institutional knowledge across generations, independent of any individual leader's survival. The military organization described in Numbers, with its census, tribal formations, assigned positions, and designated marching orders, demonstrates systematic military-administrative planning informed by Egyptian models. The elaborate Tabernacle served not only as a religious center but as a mobile coordination hub that provided a focal point for tribal unity during the wilderness wandering, exactly as Egyptian temples functioned as administrative and social coordination centers. The tithing system, regulations about gleaning and charity, sabbatical year debt forgiveness, and jubilee year land redistribution created an economic framework that reflected sophisticated understanding of how to sustain a population over time—craft knowledge developed through Egyptian experience managing agricultural societies across centuries.

What makes Moses's achievement remarkable from a craft-knowledge perspective is not that he invented new organizational principles but that he successfully adapted sophisticated Egyptian practices to a radically different context. The Israelites were not settled agriculturalists living in a centralized state. They were pastoral semi-nomads organized through kinship and tribal lineages, with different economic structures, different social organization, and different cultural traditions. Mechanically imposing Egyptian institutions would have failed. Moses instead exercised craft judgment about what to preserve, what to modify, and how to integrate Egyptian organizational principles with Israelite cultural forms. How do you calibrate the balance between central authority and tribal autonomy? How do you establish hierarchy while respecting existing clan leaders? How do you create unified identity while maintaining tribal distinctiveness? These questions have no formulaic answers. They require the kind of situated judgment that comes from deep expertise in both the organizational system being applied and the specific population being organized.

The forty years of wilderness wandering served a function that becomes clear when viewed through the lens of institutional development rather than purely through the theological framing of divine punishment. Forty years allowed the generation that had experienced Egyptian slavery—and that carried the psychological habits of subjection—to die off, replaced by a generation raised under Moses's organizational system who knew no alternative framework. Forty years allowed the legal codes to become established practice, the hierarchical structure to become normalized, the Levitical administration to become functional, the military organization to become routine. By the time the Israelites prepared to enter Canaan, Moses's organizational framework had become their lived reality rather than an imposed novelty. This is how institutions solidify—not through proclamation but through decades of lived practice until the system becomes, for its participants, simply the way things are done.

## The Question of Belief

Moses could not claim authority through any of the traditional sources available in his context. He was not from a recognized Israelite royal lineage, since none existed. He could not claim democratic election, since no such tradition existed among the tribes. He could not claim authority through conquest or through independent wealth. The only available framework for establishing authority that could transcend tribal particularism was religious: divine authorization.

This is the dimension of elite power that most people fail to understand, and it is where the comparison with Sertorius becomes most illuminating. High-level elites understand that belief is a component of power. Belief systems—religions, ideologies, cosmologies—are among the tools used to legitimate authority, to differentiate the ruler from the ruled, to create the psychological conditions under which large numbers of

people will accept the direction of a small number of leaders. This is not necessarily cynical. A leader may genuinely share the beliefs he deploys politically. But the deployment itself is a skill, and it is a skill that elite training provides.

The burning bush narrative in Exodus 3 served precisely the function of establishing authority. God identified himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—positioning Moses within existing Yahweh worship traditions rather than introducing something foreign—and commissioned Moses to lead the people. The signs and wonders—staff to serpent, the plagues, the parting of the sea, manna in the wilderness—whether understood as genuine miracles, as natural phenomena skillfully timed, or as later legendary elaboration, functioned to demonstrate that Moses possessed supernatural support and therefore merited obedience. This was sophisticated. Moses did not arrive among the Israelites claiming to represent an unknown god or a foreign religious tradition. He positioned himself within the existing belief framework of the patriarchal narratives, claimed the authority of a god the people already acknowledged, and provided evidence that his claims were genuine.

To recognize this as a strategy is not to declare it fraudulent. The point is that deploying belief systems as instruments of social coordination is itself a skill—one that elite training provides and that people without such training rarely possess. Knowing how to work with a population's existing convictions rather than attempting to impose entirely new frameworks, understanding how religious ritual creates social cohesion, recognizing that people fight harder and obey more readily when they believe supernatural forces support their cause—these are practical competencies, and they are part of the administrative craft knowledge that Moses acquired in Pharaoh's court, where the pharaoh's divine status was the keystone of the entire political system.

# Sertorius: Roman Administrative Mastery in Hispania

## The Apprenticeship

The case of Quintus Sertorius provides an invaluable secular comparison to Moses because it is documented by contemporary and near-contemporary historians—principally Plutarch, but also Appian, Sallust, and others—rather than by religious texts composed centuries after the events they describe. This allows us to observe the same portable-mastery pattern operating in a documented historical context without theological overlay, and thereby to recognize the identical mechanisms at work in the Exodus narrative.

Sertorius was born around 126 BCE in Nursia, a Sabine town in central Italy. His family was equestrian—the second tier of Roman nobility, below the senatorial aristocracy but firmly part of the governing elite, with access to education, military service, and political

careers. His early career demonstrates the standard Roman elite apprenticeship pathway through which administrative craft knowledge was transmitted across generations.

He began as a lawyer, which in the late Roman Republic meant not classroom study but apprenticeship under experienced advocates. Young men studied cases, observed trials, practiced oratory, learned procedural intricacies, and gradually took on increasingly complex cases under mentorship. This provided both explicit knowledge—specific legal doctrines, precedents, procedures—and the tacit expertise that made for effective advocacy: how to read a jury, when to deploy particular arguments, how to handle opposing counsel, how to project authority in a courtroom. Sertorius then moved into military service under Gaius Marius during the Cimbrian War, losing an eye at the Battle of Aquae Sextiae in 102 BCE but earning recognition for tactical brilliance and bravery. He served with further distinction in the Social War. This military experience provided not just combat expertise but organizational mastery—how to manage logistics for large forces, coordinate multiple units, maintain discipline, adapt tactics to terrain and enemy, and sustain campaigns over extended periods. Roman military organization was among the most sophisticated in the ancient world, developed through centuries of continuous warfare and transmitted through officer corps apprenticeship.

Sertorius then rose through the cursus honorum, the structured sequence of Roman political offices that functioned as a formal apprenticeship system for governance. He served as quaestor, managing public finances, supervising tax collection, overseeing expenditures, and maintaining accounts. He served as praetor, administering justice, interpreting law, managing courts, and handling provincial affairs. These were not honorary positions but working roles where officials learned through daily practice. Most significantly, Sertorius served as governor of Hispania around 83 BCE, giving him direct experience administering a diverse provincial population. Roman provincial governance required balancing metropolitan interests with local realities—diverse tribes, varying degrees of Romanization, complex terrain, existing power structures. Successful governors developed craft knowledge about how to work with local elites, when to use force versus negotiation, how to extract resources without provoking rebellion, how to maintain authority across dispersed territories.

By the time political conflict forced Sertorius into exile around 80 BCE, he had accumulated approximately two decades of systematic training in Roman administrative and military practice. Like Moses at forty, Sertorius possessed embodied expertise developed through sustained practice in legal advocacy, military command, financial administration, judicial decision-making, and provincial governance. The training was not abstract. It was the product of years of daily immersion in the actual exercise of power.

## The Displacement

When Sulla's proscriptions targeted Sertorius as a supporter of the defeated Marian faction, he faced execution if captured in Italy. He fled first to North Africa, where he fought campaigns in Mauretania and captured Tingis, before relocating to Hispania around 80 BCE. This was a strategic choice, not a random one. Hispania was territory where he had previously governed, where he had existing relationships with local leaders, and where he understood both the terrain and the populations. Like Moses returning to the region adjacent to where he had spent forty years in Midian, Sertorius was returning to ground he knew.

The circumstances of his return are telling. He did not arrive as a conqueror. The Lusitanians—a tribal people based in western Iberia who had suffered under the extractive and arbitrary rule of Sullan governors—actively sought him out, remembering his earlier tenure as markedly more humane than his predecessors' administrations. They offered their military support on the condition that he serve as their legitimate Roman governor. Sertorius accepted, insisting on maintaining the legal fiction that he represented the true Roman Republic against Sulla's illegitimate regime. This framing was itself an exercise of craft knowledge: by positioning himself as a lawful governor rather than a rebel chieftain, Sertorius gave his enterprise the institutional legitimacy necessary for long-term state-building rather than mere guerrilla resistance.

The Iberian tribes Sertorius encountered were formidable warriors with sophisticated local societies, but they lacked the organizational infrastructure for sustained, coordinated resistance against Roman power. The Lusitanians, Celtiberians, and other Iberian peoples had strong tribal confederations, experienced warrior aristocracies, customary legal traditions, and effective guerrilla tactics. What they lacked was unified command structures capable of coordinating multiple tribes toward common strategic objectives, systematic logistics for sustaining long campaigns, codified law for resolving inter-tribal disputes, centralized resource mobilization, and institutional frameworks that could maintain continuity beyond individual leaders' lifetimes. In short, they lacked exactly what Moses's Israelites lacked: not courage or capability, but organizational infrastructure. And Sertorius, like Moses, recognized this deficit and understood that he could provide the missing capacity.

## The Organizational Transformation

What Sertorius built in Hispania over the following years was not a military rebellion but a functioning hybrid state, and its sophistication reveals the depth of the craft knowledge he brought to the task. Plutarch's biography provides the most detailed account, supplemented by references in other ancient sources.

He established a senate of approximately three hundred members drawn from both Roman exiles who had fled Sulla's regime and prominent Iberian chiefs. This was not Roman government imposed on unwilling subjects. It was Roman organizational technology adapted for a mixed population. The senate structure created unified political authority across previously separate tribal groups by giving them shared decision-making institutions. It gave Iberian leaders meaningful participation in governance rather than mere subordination to Roman authority. It introduced Roman deliberative procedures while incorporating Iberian political traditions. And it established institutional continuity beyond any individual—decisions belonged to the senate rather than to Sertorius personally. This demonstrates exactly the kind of craft judgment that distinguishes a master from a novice: Sertorius did not simply replicate the Roman Senate, which would have made little sense in this context, nor did he impose personal dictatorship, which would have struggled for legitimacy among proud tribal leaders. He adapted the concept to create something new that combined Roman organizational principles with genuine Iberian participation.

He established a systematic legal framework that adapted Roman law to Iberian customs. Roman law was extraordinarily well developed through centuries of jurisprudence—clear procedures for different types of disputes, established principles about property rights and contracts, mechanisms for appealing decisions, integration of law with administrative authority. But mechanically imposing Roman law on Iberian tribes would have generated the same resistance that had bedeviled previous governors. Sertorius created a hybrid framework that used Roman legal structures as a template while incorporating Iberian customary practices where they did not conflict with core organizational needs. This provided consistent dispute resolution that reduced inter-tribal violence while respecting local traditions—the same balance that Moses struck between Egyptian legal principles and Israelite tribal customs.

His military organization was perhaps his most celebrated achievement. Sertorius organized Iberian warriors into Roman-style units while preserving their strengths in irregular warfare. He taught them Roman formation tactics, discipline, and coordination, but he also employed them in the guerrilla warfare that suited the rugged Spanish terrain, where conventional Roman tactics were often disadvantaged. The result was a hybrid army that combined Roman organizational capacity with Iberian tactical flexibility, and it repeatedly defeated the best armies Rome sent against it, including forces commanded by Pompey and Metellus Pius—two of the Republic's most capable generals. The sophistication here is worth dwelling on. Sertorius understood both military systems deeply enough to integrate them effectively. He recognized that Iberian warriors' strengths—mobility, knowledge of terrain, unconventional tactics—would be diminished if he tried to turn them into standard Roman legionaries. But he also understood that Iberian tribal organization alone lacked the coordination for sustained campaigns. The solution required creative adaptation informed by deep expertise in

both traditions—the mark of a true craftsman working with the materials at hand rather than wishing for different materials.

Perhaps most remarkably, and most revealing of his understanding of how elite power reproduces itself, Sertorius founded schools at Osca—modern Huesca—where the children of Iberian elite families received a Roman education. The curriculum included Latin language and literacy, Greek language and literature, Roman law and history, and rhetoric. Plutarch reports that the children adopted Roman dress and that Sertorius held examinations and distributed prizes. This investment in education served multiple strategic functions simultaneously. It created goodwill with Iberian elites by elevating their children's status and prospects. It produced a generation of bilingual, bicultural administrators who could function within Roman-style institutions while maintaining Iberian identity and loyalty. It established long-term institutional capacity—these educated children would eventually take administrative positions, ensuring continuity of the hybrid system beyond Sertorius's own lifetime. And it demonstrated his commitment to permanent state-building rather than temporary military resistance.

This reveals an extraordinarily sophisticated understanding of how elite power functions and reproduces. Sertorius was not merely fighting Rome militarily. He was building an alternative governance system and creating the next generation of administrators with the craft knowledge necessary to maintain it. He understood, in other words, exactly what this paper argues: that organizational capacity is a form of craft expertise, that it must be transmitted through training and apprenticeship, and that the long-term survival of any political system depends on producing successors who possess that expertise. It is precisely what Moses did in establishing the Levitical priesthood and designating Joshua as his successor. The parallel is not superficial. Both men were doing the same thing, for the same reasons, using the same underlying craft knowledge applied in different cultural settings.

## The Sacred Fawn

Sertorius's approach to legitimation through religion provides the most direct secular parallel to Moses's burning bush, and it is here that the comparison becomes most useful for understanding how belief functions as a tool of governance.

Plutarch describes how a hunter presented Sertorius with a young white fawn, which Sertorius trained to follow him and come when called. He then convinced the Iberians that the fawn was a gift from the goddess Diana who communicated with him through it. The mechanism was elegant in its simplicity. Sertorius maintained extensive intelligence networks throughout Hispania using scouts and spies. When his operatives reported enemy movements or local developments, Sertorius would announce that the fawn had revealed this information to him. He would crown the fawn with garlands before announcing good news, then wait for messengers to arrive confirming the "prediction."

The Iberians, whose spiritual worldview included animal messengers and divine omens, interpreted the fawn as genuine evidence of supernatural communication.

What matters here is not whether this was "true" or "false" but that it was skillful. Sertorius did not try to impose Roman gods on the Iberian population. He did not arrive claiming to be Jupiter's messenger. He recognized the Iberian belief system, identified its mechanisms—animal spirits, divine omens, the sacredness of unusual natural phenomena—and worked within that framework. He provided "evidence" calibrated to what the local population would find convincing. And the effect was precisely what he needed: soldiers fought harder believing they had divine favor, political decisions were accepted more readily when they appeared divinely guided, and rivals were hesitant to challenge authority that carried the sanction of the gods.

Now consider Moses. He did not arrive among the Israelites claiming to represent Aten or Ra or any Egyptian deity. He positioned himself within the existing Yahweh worship tradition of the patriarchs. He identified the mechanisms of Israelite belief—the memory of the patriarchal covenant, the expectation of divine deliverance, the sacredness of divine speech and miraculous signs—and worked within that framework. He provided evidence calibrated to what the Israelite population would find convincing: a burning bush that recalled the theophanic traditions of the patriarchs, signs and wonders that demonstrated supernatural backing, a series of plagues that seemed to defeat the gods of Egypt on their own ground. Whether one reads these events as genuine divine action or as the skilled deployment of legitimation by a trained administrator is, for the purposes of this analysis, beside the point. What matters is the structural parallel: both men possessed the craft knowledge to understand how belief systems function as social infrastructure, and both deployed that understanding to establish authority that transcended what their personal qualities alone could have secured.

This is the insight that most people miss about elite power and that the secular parallel of Sertorius makes visible. High-level elites understand that belief is not separate from governance. It is part of governance. The capacity to work with belief systems—to understand what a population holds sacred, to position oneself within those frameworks, to provide evidence that confirms rather than contradicts existing convictions, to use ritual and symbol to create social cohesion—is itself a component of administrative craft knowledge. It is taught and learned through the same apprenticeship processes that transmit legal expertise and military strategy. Moses learned it in the Egyptian court, where the pharaoh's divine status was the keystone of the entire political edifice. Sertorius learned it through Roman practice, where generals routinely claimed divine omens and supernatural favor as tools of military leadership—Scipio Africanus claimed Neptune's aid at New Carthage, and Alexander the Great claimed descent from Zeus-Ammon. The white fawn and the burning bush are not

so different once you understand that they served the same function within the same craft tradition of elite governance.

## The Collapse and the Contrast

In 72 BCE, Perperna assassinated Sertorius at a banquet. Perperna, jealous of Sertorius's authority and aspiring to take his place, had conspired with other Roman subordinates who resented Sertorius's elevation of Iberian allies to positions of prominence. Within weeks of the assassination, Sertorius's entire state collapsed. Perperna proved incapable of holding the coalition together. Pompey quickly defeated him, and the Iberian tribes, deprived of the organizational infrastructure that had unified them, sued for peace.

This collapse reveals the danger of systems too dependent on individual expertise without sufficient institutional depth, and it provides the most instructive contrast with Moses. Sertorius had built sophisticated governance, but he had not survived long enough—approximately eight years—for his systems to fully solidify. His schools at Osca had not yet produced a full generation of Iberian administrators with the craft knowledge to maintain Roman-style institutions independently. His senate had not yet developed sufficient institutional autonomy to function without his leadership. His military organization, while effective under his command, lacked the depth of trained officers needed to survive the loss of its architect. The white fawn's legitimating power was tied personally to Sertorius—Perperna could not simply claim the same divine favor.

Moses, by contrast, survived forty years—long enough for his organizational framework to become established practice, for the Levitical administrative class to become functional, for Joshua to be publicly designated and prepared as successor, for institutional structures to develop an existence independent of Moses's personal authority. When Moses died on Mount Nebo, his systems continued because they had been institutionalized. The Law was not Moses's personal opinion about how to resolve disputes; it was the Law, understood as divinely given and therefore binding regardless of who administered it. The priestly class was not a group of men personally loyal to Moses; it was a hereditary institution with its own internal logic and continuity. The tribal organization was not a temporary arrangement held together by one man's charisma; it was the established structure of Israelite society.

The difference between these two outcomes was not capability. Sertorius demonstrated craft mastery equal to Moses's. It was time. Had Sertorius survived another decade or two, had he successfully transferred authority to trained successors, had he built institutions robust enough to function independently, his state might well have endured. The Iberians would remember him as the Israelites remember Moses—as the founder who gave them their laws, their organizational structure, their identity as a unified people. The white fawn would be remembered as genuinely miraculous rather than as

clever intelligence tradecraft. His legal codes would seem divinely inspired rather than adapted Roman law. The difference between a historical footnote and a civilizational founder is, in many cases, simply a matter of whether the craftsman survived long enough for his work to cure.

## The Portable Elite: Why This Pattern Matters

The parallel between Moses and Sertorius is not an isolated curiosity. It illuminates a structural feature of how power works that has implications far beyond these two figures. The pattern—trained elite displaced from original structure, rebuilds authority in new context by providing organizational capacity, succeeds or fails based on institutional depth and succession—recurs across history because the underlying mechanism is structural rather than contingent.

What Moses and Sertorius possessed was not charisma or divine favor or exceptional native intelligence, though they may have had all of these as well. What they possessed was a skillset. The word is deliberately mundane. What high-level administrators do is complex, and they acquire it through the same processes by which any complex skill is acquired: through years of immersion and apprenticeship, typically beginning in childhood, within environments where the skill is practiced daily. A Roman senator's son has been watching political maneuvering since infancy, has accompanied his father to the Forum since age ten, has participated in family discussions of strategy and tactics throughout his youth. By age twenty, he has fifteen years of informal apprenticeship. A peasant's son of equal innate ability but lacking this exposure cannot compete, not because he is less intelligent but because he lacks the embodied expertise that only sustained immersion can provide. The same is true of an Egyptian prince raised in the royal court. The same is true of elite administrative classes in every sophisticated civilization. The skill is not inherited biologically. It is transmitted culturally, through the same apprenticeship mechanisms that transmit any complex craft.

Being an "elite" is, in this sense, a prerequisite. Not because elites are better people, but because elite status provides the conditions necessary for acquiring administrative craft knowledge. Elites are not tied to the land or to manual labor. They do not spend their days growing food, herding animals, or working raw materials. They are freed from these necessities precisely so that they can spend their lives in the apprenticeship of governance—learning how to organize people, command military forces, navigate legal systems, manage resources, conduct diplomacy, deploy belief systems as instruments of social cohesion. This is their trade. And like any trade, it takes years to learn and a lifetime to master.

This insight cuts both ways. On one hand, it demystifies elite power. Moses was not a unique channel of divine wisdom but a highly trained administrator applying learned

expertise with exceptional skill. His laws were not unprecedented divine revelations but adaptations of well-established Ancient Near Eastern legal traditions. His organizational methods were not born of prophetic inspiration but of Egyptian administrative practice refined over centuries. Recognizing this does not diminish his achievement—adapting that knowledge to the radically different Israelite context was itself a masterwork of craft judgment—but it does locate his accomplishment in the human rather than the supernatural realm.

On the other hand, this insight also explains why elite power is so durable and so difficult to challenge. If administrative capacity were merely a matter of intelligence or goodwill, then any capable person could learn to govern effectively from a few years of study. But because it is craft knowledge—tacit, embodied, requiring years of apprenticeship, accumulated across generations—it cannot be easily democratized. The gap between those who possess it and those who do not is not a gap of intelligence or moral worth. It is a gap of training, and that gap is maintained by the same mechanisms that have always maintained craft monopolies: restricted access to apprenticeship, controlled entry into the practicing community, and the sheer time required to develop genuine mastery.

The comparison between Moses and Sertorius also reveals something about how we read the Bible that deserves attention. When we encounter the Exodus narrative within its theological framework, we tend to accept the supernatural explanations at face value or reject the entire account as myth. What the secular parallel of Sertorius offers is a third possibility: that the events described in the Exodus narrative—the organizational transformation, the legal codification, the hierarchical delegation, the legitimation through religious authority—are descriptions of real processes that operated according to recognizable sociological and political principles, carried out by a real figure who possessed real expertise acquired through real training. The theological framing is the Israelites' own interpretation of what happened, just as the Iberians' attribution of Sertorius's intelligence reports to a sacred fawn was their interpretation of his superior information. In both cases, what the leader actually did was apply craft knowledge that his followers lacked the training to recognize as craft knowledge, and therefore attributed to the only explanation framework available to them: the divine.

This does not require atheism or cynicism about religious belief. It requires only the recognition that extraordinary competence, when exercised by someone with training that the surrounding population lacks, looks like magic to those who cannot see the mechanism. When a skilled blacksmith produces a Damascus steel blade of seemingly impossible quality, it looks like sorcery to someone who has never worked metal. When a trained administrator transforms a disorganized tribal population into a coordinated polity with functioning law, military capacity, and economic management, it looks like divine intervention to people who have never seen governance being constructed from

the inside. The miracle is real. It is simply not supernatural. It is the miracle of craft mastery applied with skill and sustained over time.

## Conclusion: The Craft That Endures

Moses and Sertorius were, at the deepest structural level, the same kind of man. Both were products of sophisticated imperial training systems that invested decades in producing administrators capable of managing complex societies. Both were expelled from those systems by political violence. Both encountered populations that possessed strong identities and real capabilities but lacked the organizational infrastructure to translate those qualities into sustained, coordinated political existence. Both provided the missing organizational capacity by adapting their inherited expertise to local conditions with the kind of creative judgment that distinguishes master craftsmen from competent technicians. Both understood that belief systems are tools of governance and deployed religious legitimation with skill calibrated to local frameworks. And the divergence in their legacies—Moses the civilizational founder, Sertorius the historical footnote—reflects not a difference in capability but a difference in how much time each was granted to let his work solidify into durable institutional form.

The craft of rule is neither mysterious nor simple. Like any craft, it involves skills that can be identified, analyzed, and understood. But like any craft, understanding it intellectually is not the same as possessing it. The blacksmith's knowledge lives in his hands. The administrator's knowledge lives in his judgment, his instincts, his capacity to read situations and respond appropriately without conscious deliberation. These cannot be transmitted through books. They must be acquired through years of apprenticeship in environments where the craft is practiced daily. This is why elite power reproduces itself so reliably across generations: not because elites are superior beings, but because they control access to the training environments that produce administrative mastery.

For readers of the Old Testament, the implications are significant. The organizational achievements attributed to Moses—the legal code, the hierarchical administration, the priestly class, the military organization, the tribal federation unified under shared religious institutions—become more intelligible, not less, when we understand them as the work of a trained administrator rather than as inexplicable prophetic genius. We can appreciate the genuine sophistication of what Moses built, see why it endured where other ancient organizational experiments did not, and understand the specific mechanisms by which he transformed a collection of tribes into a people with the institutional capacity to survive conquest, exile, and diaspora across millennia. The burning bush did not teach Moses how to delegate judicial authority or codify case law or establish a hereditary priestly administration. Pharaoh's court taught him those things. What he did with that knowledge in the service of a people and a god he believed in—that is the story worth telling.

Sertorius reminds us what that story looks like without the theological framing. A brilliant man, trained in the most sophisticated administrative tradition of his era, expelled by political violence, arriving among a population that needed what he could provide, building something remarkable through years of effort, and then losing it all to an assassin's blade before the institutions could fully set. His fawn is forgotten. His schools are ruins. His senate is a footnote in Plutarch. But the craft knowledge he possessed was real, and for a few years in the mountains and plains of Hispania, it transformed everything it touched. Moses was luckier, or more blessed, or simply granted more time. The craft was the same.

# Thematic Bibliography

The Craft of Rule: Elite Administrative Knowledge

as Apprenticed Mastery in Moses and Sertorius

---

**Note on Research and Composition**

This paper was developed through an extended conversational collaboration between the author and Claude (Anthropic), which served as researcher and essay composer throughout the project. The arguments, interpretive framework, and core thesis are the author's own, developed over the course of sustained dialogue. Claude assisted with research, drafting, structural organization, and the synthesis of primary and secondary source material into the narrative form presented here. This bibliography was likewise compiled and annotated collaboratively.

---

# I. Tacit Knowledge, Craft Expertise, and Skill Acquisition

The theoretical backbone of this paper's argument—that elite administrative capacity functions as craft knowledge rather than as codifiable instruction—draws on a body of work in epistemology, cognitive science, and the sociology of expertise. The following works establish the conceptual vocabulary of tacit knowledge, apprenticeship, and embodied skill that the paper applies to political and administrative domains.

Polanyi, Michael. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958.

> Polanyi's foundational work arguing that all knowledge contains a personal, tacit component that cannot be fully articulated in propositional form. His analysis of how scientists, craftsmen, and practitioners "know more than they can tell" provides the core theoretical concept this paper applies to administrative expertise. His treatment of apprenticeship and tradition as vehicles for transmitting knowledge that resists codification is directly relevant to the argument about elite training.

Polanyi, Michael. *The Tacit Dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.

> A more concise and accessible statement of the tacit knowledge thesis, based on the 1962 Terry Lectures at Yale. Contains the famous formulation that "we can know more than we can tell" and develops the distinction between focal and subsidiary awareness that explains how experts perceive situations holistically rather than through step-by-step analysis.

Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Stuart E. Dreyfus. *Mind Over Machine: The Power of Human Intuition and Expertise in the Era of the Computer*. New York: Free Press, 1986.

> Develops the influential five-stage model of skill acquisition (novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient, expert) that this paper invokes to explain why administrative mastery cannot be shortcut through formal instruction alone. The Dreyfus model demonstrates that experts operate through pattern recognition and intuitive judgment rather than rule-following, explaining why years of practice are required.

Ryle, Gilbert. *The Concept of Mind*. London: Hutchinson, 1949.

> The classic philosophical distinction between "knowing that" (propositional knowledge) and "knowing how" (practical skill), which underpins the paper's argument that reading about governance is categorically different from being able to govern. Ryle's "anti-intellectualist" position—that practical competence is not reducible to theoretical understanding—is foundational for the craft-knowledge framework.

Nonaka, Ikujiro, and Hirotaka Takeuchi. *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Firms Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Though focused on corporate knowledge management, Nonaka and Takeuchi's model of how tacit knowledge is socialized, externalized, combined, and internalized provides a useful framework for understanding how administrative expertise passes between individuals and generations within elite institutions.

Collins, Harry. *Tacit and Explicit Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Collins refines and extends Polanyi's original concept by distinguishing between somatic tacit knowledge (embodied in bodily skills), relational tacit knowledge (knowledge that could be made explicit but is not, for social reasons), and collective tacit knowledge (knowledge embedded in social practices). All three categories are relevant to elite administrative capacity.

Sennett, Richard. *The Craftsman*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

A wide-ranging exploration of craftsmanship as a model for engaged, skilled work. Sennett's treatment of how craftsmen develop expertise through sustained practice, and his argument that craft knowledge involves a dialogue between hand and mind, provides conceptual support for extending the craft metaphor to administrative expertise.

Ericsson, K. Anders, Ralf Th. Krampe, and Clemens Tesch-Römer. "The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance." *Psychological Review* 100, no. 3 (1993): 363–406.

The foundational study on deliberate practice and expertise, demonstrating that expert performance in any domain requires approximately ten years (or ten thousand hours) of sustained, feedback-guided practice. Supports the paper's argument that administrative expertise requires comparable apprenticeship periods.

## II. Egyptian Administration, Education, and Scribal Culture

Understanding what Moses may have learned in Pharaoh's court requires understanding the Egyptian administrative and educational systems of the New Kingdom period. The following works reconstruct the training, institutional structures, and documentary practices that constituted the "wisdom of the Egyptians" referenced in Acts 7:22.

Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Though focused on Rome, Bonner's comprehensive treatment of ancient educational systems provides comparative context for understanding how elite training functioned across the ancient Mediterranean. His analysis of apprenticeship, rhetorical education,

and the relationship between schooling and governance is relevant to both the Moses and Sertorius sections.

Williams, Ronald J. “Scribal Training in Ancient Egypt.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92, no. 2 (1972): 214–221.

A key study of the evolution of scribal education from the Old Kingdom through the New Kingdom, tracing how training shifted from private father-son transmission to more institutionalized forms. Documents how scribal positions were substantially hereditary and how apprenticeship involved working “under the hand of the scribe”—directly supporting the paper’s craft-knowledge framework.

Allon, Niv, and Hana Navratilova. *Ancient Egyptian Scribes: A Cultural Exploration*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Provides biographical studies of ten scribal individuals from the New Kingdom, demonstrating the wide range of functions that “scribal” expertise encompassed—from low-level record-keeping to the highest administrative positions. Challenges the common equation of “literate elite” with “scribal elite,” showing that the term “scribe” was used symbolically by high officials to signal mastery of administrative competence.

Lazaridis, Nikolaos. “Education and Apprenticeship.” In *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*. Los Angeles, 2010.

A concise scholarly overview of Egyptian educational systems, documenting that the main purpose of education was training scribes and specialist craftsmen, that access was restricted primarily to elite males, and that apprenticeship was the principal pedagogical method for specialized training. Confirms the paper’s characterization of Egyptian education as profession-oriented and access-controlled.

Quirke, Stephen. “Scribal Identity.” In *The Administration of Egypt in the Late Middle Kingdom*. New Malden: Sia Publishing, 1990.

Examines the administrative structures of the Egyptian state and the role of scribal identity within them. Quirke’s suggestion that “scribe” be translated “secretary”—since the term encompassed everything from low-level clerks to the equivalent of “Secretary of State”—highlights the administrative character of scribal expertise.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. 3 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973–1980.

The standard English translation and commentary on Egyptian literary texts, including the Satire of the Trades (also known as the Instruction of Dua-Khety), which provides direct evidence of how scribal education promoted elite identity by contrasting the miseries of manual trades with the privileges of literate administrative careers. Demonstrates how educational texts functioned as instruments of elite reproduction.

Kemp, Barry J. *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2018.

> A comprehensive treatment of Egyptian civilization that integrates administrative, economic, religious, and social dimensions. Particularly valuable for understanding how Egyptian temples functioned as administrative and economic centers—the model that the paper argues Moses adapted in establishing the Tabernacle and Levitical system.

## III. Moses, the Exodus, and Ancient Near Eastern Legal Traditions

The paper's argument about Moses depends on understanding the Exodus narrative not only theologically but as a document reflecting real administrative and legal practices with well-attested Ancient Near Eastern parallels. The following works address the historicity of Moses, the parallels between Mosaic law and other Near Eastern legal codes, and the organizational structures described in the Pentateuch.

Wright, David P. *Inventing God's Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

> Wright argues that the Covenant Code in Exodus 21–23 is directly and substantially dependent on the Laws of Hammurabi, representing a "creative rewriting" of Mesopotamian legal sources. This supports the paper's argument that Mosaic law reflects inherited Near Eastern legal traditions adapted to Israelite context rather than unprecedented divine revelation.

Westbrook, Raymond, ed. *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

> The comprehensive reference work on legal systems across the ancient Near East, covering Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Hittite, and Israelite legal traditions. Provides the comparative framework necessary for understanding what Moses may have drawn upon and how different legal systems influenced one another.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

> Kitchen argues for the historical plausibility of the Old Testament narratives based on their fit with known Near Eastern practices and documentary forms. His analysis of the Sinai covenant as following second-millennium BCE treaty forms, and his argument that the Pentateuchal legislation is within the competence of a suitably trained individual, directly supports the paper's characterization of Moses as a trained administrator.

Levinson, Bernard M. "The Founding of Israel's Judicial System." In *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Demonstrates that Deuteronomy 1:9–18 systematically revises Exodus 18's account of the founding of the judicial system, removing the Midianite Jethro's role and crediting Moses directly. This revision reveals ancient discomfort with the foreign origins of Israelite judicial organization—an important piece of evidence that the Exodus account reflects genuine administrative borrowing rather than literary invention.

Assmann, Jan. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Examines how the figure of Moses has functioned at the intersection of Egyptian and Israelite cultural memory. While Assmann's primary interest is in the "Mosaic distinction" between true and false religion, his treatment of Moses's Egyptian identity and the ways later traditions negotiated it provides useful context for the paper's argument.

Hoffmeier, James K. *Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Marshals archaeological and textual evidence for the historical plausibility of the Exodus narrative, including evidence for Semitic populations in Egypt, Egyptian administrative practices reflected in the biblical text, and the geographical and cultural knowledge embedded in the Pentateuch. Relevant to the paper's assumption that Moses represents a historical figure with genuine Egyptian training.

Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 1–18* and *Exodus 19–40*. Anchor Yale Bible Commentary, vols. 2–2A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999, 2006.

The most detailed contemporary scholarly commentary on Exodus, providing exhaustive treatment of textual, historical, and comparative dimensions. Propp's analysis of the legal, administrative, and organizational material in Exodus provides the scholarly grounding for the paper's claims about Mosaic institutional design.

## IV. Quintus Sertorius and Roman Provincial Administration

The Sertorius case study depends on ancient biographical and historical sources supplemented by modern scholarship on Roman provincial governance, military organization, and the late Republican political crisis. The following works provide the evidentiary basis for the paper's treatment of Sertorius.

Plutarch. "Life of Sertorius." In *Parallel Lives*. Various editions and translations; Bernadotte Perrin, trans., Loeb Classical Library, 1919.

The primary biographical source for Sertorius, written approximately 150 years after his death. Plutarch's account provides the details on which the paper's case study is based: the schools at Osca, the senate of three hundred, the white fawn, the hybrid military

organization, and the collapse following assassination. Plutarch pairs Sertorius with Eumenes, drawing lessons about character, fortune, and the dangers of dependence on individual leadership.

Konrad, Christoph F. *Plutarch's Sertorius: A Historical Commentary*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

The standard scholarly commentary on Plutarch's Life of Sertorius, providing historical context, source criticism, and detailed analysis of individual episodes. Essential for evaluating which details in Plutarch's account are historically reliable and which reflect Plutarch's didactic purposes.

Spann, Philip O. *Quintus Sertorius and the Legacy of Sulla*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1987.

A modern political and military biography of Sertorius that situates his Iberian enterprise within the broader context of the late Republican civil wars. Spann provides detailed analysis of Sertorius's military campaigns, administrative innovations, and the political dynamics that led to his assassination.

Matyszak, Philip. *Sertorius and the Struggle for Spain*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword Military, 2013.

A narrative military history of the Sertorian War that provides accessible coverage of the campaigns, tactics, and strategic context. Useful for understanding Sertorius's hybrid military system and the logistical challenges of sustaining a breakaway state against Roman opposition.

Richardson, J. S. *Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218–82 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Provides the broader context of Roman involvement in Iberia that preceded Sertorius, including the patterns of provincial governance, military exploitation, and cultural interaction that shaped the environment into which Sertorius arrived. Essential for understanding why Iberian populations welcomed Sertorius's administration as an improvement over previous Roman governance.

Wolff, Catherine. "The Role of Education in the Latinization of the Roman West." In *Social Factors in the Latinization of the Roman West,* edited by Alex Mullen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024.

Addresses the broader context of Roman educational policy in the western provinces, within which Sertorius's schools at Osca represent an early and distinctive case. Relevant to understanding how education functioned as a tool of cultural integration and elite reproduction in Roman provincial settings.

Lintott, Andrew. *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Provides the institutional context for understanding the Roman constitutional and administrative structures that Sertorius replicated and adapted in Hispania—the senate, the cursus honorum, the magistracies, the provincial governance system, and the military command hierarchy.

## V. Elite Reproduction, Power, and Social Organization

The paper's broader argument—that elite power is maintained through restricted access to administrative craft knowledge transmitted via apprenticeship—engages with sociological and political-theoretical traditions concerned with how elites form, reproduce, and maintain dominance. The following works inform the paper's structural analysis.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Bourdieu's analysis of how cultural capital—including the embodied dispositions he calls "habitus"—functions as a mechanism of elite reproduction is directly relevant to the paper's argument. His concept of habitus as the set of durable, transposable dispositions acquired through sustained immersion in elite environments closely parallels the paper's characterization of administrative expertise as embodied craft knowledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Translated by Lauretta C. Clough. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Examines how elite educational institutions in France produce and reproduce governing classes, demonstrating that elite schools transmit not just credentials but dispositional knowledge—ways of being, judging, and acting that constitute practical competence in governance. Directly relevant to the paper's argument about how elite training institutions function as apprenticeship systems.

Mosca, Gaetano. *The Ruling Class*. Edited and revised by Arthur Livingston. Translated by Hannah D. Kahn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Mosca's classic formulation of elite theory argues that all societies are governed by organized minorities possessing superior organizational capacity. His concept of the "political formula"—the ideology through which ruling classes legitimate their authority—is relevant to the paper's analysis of how Moses and Sertorius deployed belief systems as tools of governance.

Michels, Robert. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: Hearst's International Library, 1915.

Michels's "iron law of oligarchy"—the argument that all organizations, regardless of democratic intentions, inevitably develop elite leadership—provides structural context

for the paper's analysis of why organizational capacity inherently creates hierarchies and concentrations of power.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. 2 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Weber's typology of legitimate authority (traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal) provides the theoretical framework within which Moses and Sertorius's legitimation strategies can be analyzed. His treatment of bureaucracy as a form of rational-legal authority and his analysis of how charismatic authority becomes routinized into institutional forms are both directly relevant.

Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Condition Human Life Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Scott's analysis of how states impose legibility on populations through standardization, codification, and administrative simplification provides a useful lens for understanding what Moses and Sertorius were doing when they established legal codes, conducted censuses, and organized tribal populations into administratively manageable units.

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power*. Vol. 1, *A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Mann's analysis of how power operates through ideological, economic, military, and political networks provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the multiple dimensions of administrative craft knowledge deployed by figures like Moses and Sertorius, who integrated all four forms of power into coherent governance systems.

## VI. Religion, Legitimation, and the Politics of Belief

Central to the paper's argument is the claim that high-level elites understand belief as a component of governance and deploy religious legitimation as a learned skill. The following works address the relationship between religion, political authority, and elite power.

Assmann, Jan. *The Price of Monotheism*. Translated by Robert Savage. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Examines how the establishment of exclusive monotheism created a new kind of religious-political authority with unprecedented capacity for social control and group cohesion. Relevant to understanding how the Mosaic religious innovation provided organizational advantages beyond those available through polytheistic systems.

Bellah, Robert N. *Religion in Human Evolution: From the Paleolithic to the Axial Age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011.

Bellah's sweeping analysis of how religious systems co-evolved with forms of social organization provides deep historical context for understanding religion as an organizational technology rather than purely as a matter of private belief. His treatment of how ritual creates social solidarity is relevant to the paper's analysis of the Tabernacle and Levitical system.

Geertz, Clifford. "Religion as a Cultural System." In *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Geertz's influential definition of religion as a system of symbols that establishes powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations provides the theoretical vocabulary for analyzing how Moses and Sertorius used religious symbols and narratives to establish and maintain authority.

Trigger, Bruce G. *Understanding Early Civilizations: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

A systematic comparative study of seven early civilizations, demonstrating consistent patterns in how political authority was legitimated through religious ideology, including the near-universal claim of divine sanction for rulers. Provides the cross-cultural context within which Moses's and Sertorius's legitimation strategies can be understood as instances of a widespread pattern.

Lincoln, Bruce. *Authority: Construction and Corrosion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

A concise theoretical analysis of how authority is constructed and maintained through the interplay of force, persuasion, and performance. Lincoln's treatment of how authority claims must be calibrated to audience expectations is directly relevant to the paper's analysis of why Moses and Sertorius adapted their legitimation strategies to local belief systems.

***---***

*****Copyright and Licensing*****

***© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan***

***This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.***
***To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/***

*****You are free to:*****
***- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format***
***- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material***

*****Under the following terms:*****
***- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit***
***- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes***

*This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations**

*---*